



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,842	01/02/2002	Dan Kikinis	1028-042-1	6723

22208 7590 04/07/2006

ROBERTS ABOKHAIR & MARDULA
SUITE 1000
11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,842	KIKINIS, DAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peling A. Shaw	2144	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Peling A. Shaw. (3) Elliott Light (Reg. No. 51948).
 (2) William Vaughn. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 April 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Interview agenda and proposed amendment.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Grantges (US 6324648 B1).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the subject matter of invention and the referred art in the 102 rejection in the Office Action dated 11/30/2006 were briefly discussed. The proposed amendment seems to overcome the 102 rejection in the Office Action dated 11/30/2005. The interview agenda and proposed amendment is appended.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

APPLICATION No. 10/037,842
OFFICE ACTION MAILED NOV. 30, 2005
FOR
A REMOTE PROXY SERVER AGENT

Dear Mr. Shaw:

Thank you for speaking to me today about scheduling a telephonic interview regarding the above-referenced application. As you requested, I am providing you a summary of the issues we would like to discuss with you during the requested interview. Of course, we will submit a formal response to the office action after we our interview.

A. The Application

The specification of the present application notes that that a small business does typically not operate on a shared corporate WAN, and does not, typically, individually host and maintain a proxy server. The invention is directed to a shared proxy system that provides the functionality of a proxy server through remote proxy agents (RPAs) installed on a gateway and on at least one data processing computer. According the specification, the RPA is adapted to render its host PC as a server capable of filling requests according to demand. An object of the present invention is to provide viable proxy services to mobile users (phone 107) that normally would not be practical such as being able to look up a document on a desktop machine (166a-n) in the office or to send an email by proxy even though the company (business 115) is small and may have just two or three employees and no real Intranet or Web services other than typical Web pages hosted for company 115 on an ISP server such as server 111. RPA instances 118a-n provide the capability in conjunction with an instance of remote agent gateway (RAGW) 105 installed and operational in WAP-GW 104 within wireless network 103.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention provides the functionality of a proxy server without the need for the dedicated hardware associated with the operation of a dedicated proxy server.

B. The Cited References

Claim 1 of the application as examined recites the following limitations:

1. (Currently Amended) A software system for enabling remote data access to and task execution on a data processing system **through a proxy server** comprising:
an instance of the software residing on the data processing system for receiving and analyzing requests and performing according to a request directive; and

an instance of the software residing on the proxy server for identifying and authenticating a user and for redirecting requests to the data processing system; characterized in that a user connects to a network accessible to the data processing system and initiates a request for services, wherein the request is, after authentication of the user, redirected from the proxy server to the data processing system for task execution and possible return of results according to the contents of the request.

This claim was rejected as being anticipated by Grantges (USP 6324648). Grantges teaches using two proxy servers between a user and the network device the user seeks to access. A DMZ proxy server 34 on the public side of firewall 32 does not “know” the URL of destination computers 28. This information resides on the private side of firewall 32 in gateway proxy server 40. To support this scheme requires a significant investment in hardware that the present invention seeks to avoid.

Referring to Figure 1 of the present application, there is no proxy server on the private side of firewall router 109. Rather, an instance of a software system resides in the data processing system (116) to provide communication with WPA gateway 104 through another instance of the software RAGW 105. This software system is not described by Grantges because it is not contemplated by Grantges.




Fig. 1

The RPA of the present invention permits remote access to specific servers of small business 115 without the need for a proxy server. Claims directed to this invention would not be obvious or anticipated:

Note that the omission of an element and retention of its function is an indicia of unobviousness. In re Edge, 359 F.2d 896, 149 USPQ 556 (CCPA 1966) (Claims at issue were directed to a printed sheet having a thin layer of erasable metal bonded directly to the sheet wherein said thin layer obscured the original print until removal by erasure. The prior art disclosed a similar printed sheet which further comprised an intermediate transparent and erasure-proof protecting layer which prevented erasure of the printing when the top layer was erased. The claims were found unobvious over the prior art because although the transparent layer of the prior art was eliminated, the function of the transparent layer was retained since appellant's metal layer could be erased without erasing the printed indicia.). (See, MPEP, 2144.04 II.B, 8th Ed. Aug. 2005).

C. A Proposed New Claim

Applicant proposes to revise claim 1 to capture the distinction described above. For discussion purposes, Applicant has included the following draft claim:

1. (DRAFT) A software system for enabling remote data access to and task execution on a data processing system through remote agents comprising:

a remote gateway agent residing on a gateway, wherein the gateway is accessible to a user device and to a remote proxy agent via a network, and wherein the remote gateway agent is adapted for:

- receiving a registration request from the remote proxy agent, wherein the remote proxy agent resides on the data processing system;

- registering the remote proxy agent with the remote gateway agent;

- receiving a request for access to the data processing system from the user device;

- determining whether the user device is entitled to access the data processing system; and

- forwarding the request for access to the data processing system if the user device is entitled to access the data processing system; and

the remote proxy agent residing on the data processing system adapted for:

- registering with the remote gateway agent;

- receiving and analyzing the request from the remote gateway agent;

- directing the request to the data processing system for processing; and

- sending a result from the data processing system to the user device via the network.